



County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

JOHN L. SNYDER
DIRECTOR

5555 OVERLAND AVE, SUITE 2188
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1295

(858) 694-2212 FAX: (858) 268-0461
WEB SITE: WWW.SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV/DPW/

August 20, 2008

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form **(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)**

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:

Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail, COFD-00251
2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego
Department of Public Works
5469 Kearny Villa Road, Suite 305
San Diego, CA 92123
3. a. Contact: Esther Daigneault, Environmental Planning Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 874-4107
c. E-mail: esther.daigneault@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:

The project is located adjacent to the Sweetwater Reservoir near the community of Spring Valley in the unincorporated area of San Diego County (*Figure 1 and Figure 2*).

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1291: A4, A5, A6, B4, B7, C4, D3, E2, F3, G2, H2; Page 1310: J1; Page 1311: A1

5. Project Applicant name and address:
County of San Diego
Department of Parks and Recreation
9150 Chesapeake Drive, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92123

6. General Plan Designation
Community Plan: N/A
Land Use Designation: N/A
Density: N/A

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: N/A
Minimum Lot Size: N/A
Special Area Regulation: N/A

8. Description of project:

The proposed project will establish and formalize the northern portion of the Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail. The proposed project will connect to the existing southern portion of the trail so as to eventually allow for non-motorized recreational opportunities completely around the Sweetwater Reservoir, a 14.1-mile loop trail. The proposed project (northern loop trail proper) is approximately 5.3 miles in length. In addition, a trail segment (Segment 1a) will be constructed along an existing dirt path adjacent to the Bonita Golf Course between Conduit Road and the Bonita Road Bridge, connecting the entire loop trail (northern and southern portions) to an existing trail system to the west. Segment 1a is approximately 0.64 miles in length. This document only addresses the segments that will be constructed by the County.

The proposed northern trail to be constructed by the County is divided into eight trail segments (Segments 1, 1a, and 3 through 8), including drainage crossings over several named and unnamed drainages and two trail staging areas. *Figure 3* identifies the location of each of the trail segments and the two staging areas. The remaining segments of the northern trail not proposed by the County include Segment 2, which will be the responsibility of Caltrans as part of mitigation for the SR 125 Extension Project; Segment 9, which is expected to be constructed by Pointe Development; and Segment 10, which would be constructed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) San Diego National Wildlife Refuge. Construction of these segments is not analyzed as part of the proposed project.

The two staging areas will serve as a trailhead and/or rest area providing hikers and equestrian riders access to both the northern and southern trail systems, as well as providing users with parking, bathroom and drinking water facilities, trash receptacles, equestrian hitching posts, and benches. Staging Area 1 is an existing facility located within the County's Sweetwater Summit Park. Staging Area 1 is equipped with all the necessary amenities and can be accessed at the end of Red Hill Trail. Staging Area 2 is currently a vacant lot located near the intersection of Lakeview Avenue and Quarry Road. Completion of Staging Area 2 will require installation of the above mentioned facilities.

The northern portions of the Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail will be improved and maintained in accordance with the County of San Diego Trail Design Guidelines. Trail routes were selected to avoid and minimize potential impacts to streambeds and sensitive vegetation to the maximum extent practicable. The proposed project will establish trails along existing disturbed trails (non-designated), paths and roadways wherever feasible. In general, the width of the trail tread will vary between 8 and 12 feet with a minimum 10-foot overhead clearance. The width of the trail will be no more than four feet wide in areas adjacent to sensitive biological habitats including wetland habitats. The trail surface will be removed of rocks, debris, and roots. Acquisition of trail easements over private property will be required to implement the project.

Trail markers, intermediate markers, and lodge pole fencing will be used where necessary to encourage users to stay on the trails and to direct users to avoid sensitive biological areas. Pressure treated wood with waterproof coating will be used for lodge pole posts and rails. Trail markers will be placed at approximately one-fourth mile increments along the route. Trail markers will be brown, flexible reinforced composite-fiberglass. The markers will be approximately 72 inches high, 3 ¾ inches wide, 1/8 inch thick and weigh approximately 2 ½ pounds. Trail lighting is not permitted within wildlife habitat except where essential for roadways, facility use and safety. If such lighting is necessary, lighting within wildlife habitat or along its edges will be shielded and directed away from wildlife habitat and limited to low pressure sodium sources.

Physical and/or visual barriers such as natural vegetation, topography, limited fencing, and signage will be incorporated into project design to protect sensitive habitats, sensitive species, and wetland habitats by directing trail users to designated trails. The use of motorized vehicles on the trails is prohibited, except for wheelchairs, maintenance and emergency vehicles. Foot traffic, equestrian

activity, and bicycling will be restricted to designated trails only. In addition, dogs must be leashed at all times and restricted to designated trails. The release or translocation of non-native animals, fish, or vegetation, or the collection of plants, plant material, wildlife, or historic artifacts will not be allowed. In addition, hunting of animals or waterfowl along the trail segments or adjacent to the reservoir is prohibited.

During construction, temporary fencing will be installed to identify construction and staging area limits. All construction activities, including equipment storage, equipment cleaning, and stockpiling will occur within the identified construction areas. All storage areas will be protected with the use of fiber rolls and/or silt fences. All fencing will be inspected prior to the start of construction and monitored during construction by a qualified biologist to avoid unauthorized impacts. Temporary watering of the construction site will be conducted on an as-needed basis to prevent potential dust damage to sensitive vegetation and habitat.

As part of the proposed project, an erosion control plan will be implemented with erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, hay bales, and/or the installation of sediment traps. In addition, Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction activities to avoid water quality impacts, polluted runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. BMPs include, but are not limited to, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls will be used to minimize surface transport of sediments. The construction contractor will be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Implementation of BMPs as stated in contract documents and the SWPPP would reduce water quality impacts to below a level of significance.

The proposed project incorporates site design considerations intended to reduce potential pollutants in runoff and minimize impacts to water quality. At all locations, the proposed trail will be set back at least 100 feet from the high water level. Horses will be prohibited from entering the reservoir or any stream within 200 feet of the reservoir shoreline. Chain-link fencing will be installed along the perimeter of the trail to prevent entry to the reservoir. Daily inspections may be necessary before, during, and after rain or storm events to ensure the integrity of the trail system. Manure, trash, litter and debris will be removed in a timely manner prior to a rain or storm event. If necessary, trails will be closed during severe rain events. Temporary signage will be installed at trail heads, staging

areas, and/or at the adjacent Sweetwater Summit Regional Park during inclement weather advising users of trail closures.

Proposed *Rules and Regulations* for trail use include a requirement that pet owners must pick up after pets and dispose of any wastes offsite or in proper locations identified onsite. Signage will be posted in designated areas as appropriate. Pet waste bags will be provided for owners at staging areas. Prior to opening the trail to public use, the County will contract with a licensed waste disposal facility to establish a schedule for waste removal. Horse manure will be removed from the trail on a weekly basis by County-contracted personnel. Storage containers will not be necessary as manure will be removed offsite immediately. The County may also investigate the use of manure in off-site composting operations as a less expensive alternative to the removal of waste to a disposal facility.

Trail inspection and necessary maintenance will be performed by County personnel or volunteers on an as-needed basis to pick up trash and debris, smooth the trail, repair fences, and trim vegetation. Trail brochures and signage, indicating the reservoir is a source of domestic water supply and should not be polluted, will be provided to educate the public and discourage any type of pollution. Location and distances to staging area trash and restroom facilities, commercial areas, and bus stops will be provided on signs and/or brochures.

In areas along the trail system where the trail tread is between 10 feet and 25 feet from the Urban Runoff Diversion System (URDS), a 12-inch gravel gutter and vegetated buffer strip with a slope less than 15% toward the reservoir, will be installed along the shoreward edge of the trail. The buffer strip will trap sediment, nutrients, trash, and organics, and prevent these materials from migrating toward the reservoir or entering the URDS. Runoff will flow into the gravel gutter and sheet flow onto the vegetated buffer strip. In areas where the trail is less than 10 feet from the URDS, a 12-inch gravel gutter and vegetated strip as stated above will apply with the addition of an impervious landscaping edge as close to the URDS as possible. The landscape edging is designed to prevent runoff from entering the URDS until it has been properly treated via the vegetated buffer strip. Maintenance of the vegetated buffer strips would consist of mowing, irrigation if necessary, weeding, and litter removal. Maintenance of the gravel gutter will consist of an annual inspection and removal of sediment if necessary.

The trail will be designed to ensure runoff sheet flows toward proposed BMPs (i.e. vegetated buffer strip and gravel gutter) to prevent rills and erosion. The trail will be periodically re-graded to prevent rills from forming, to promote sheet flow, and to reduce erosion. The re-grading will be on an as-needed basis, but a minimum of one time per year at the end of the rainy season. The effective combination of site control, source control, and treatment control Best Management Practices (BMPs) described above is intended to protect the quality of water in the reservoir.

Segment 1

Segment 1 begins at the convergence of Sweetwater Road and Quarry Road and is approximately 2,900 feet long. From the trailhead, the trail moves south for approximately 1,050 feet, turns east for approximately 400 feet, and turns north again, following the western boundary of the Bonita Golf Course for approximately 1,450 feet where it connects to Segment 4. The segment will be located within a trail easement varying in width from 12 feet to 20 feet, with the trail tread varying between 4 feet (adjacent to sensitive habitat) and 10 feet.

Drainage improvements required for this segment include installation of 18" and 24" corrugated metal pipe (CMP) culverts that will convey drainage from the trail and adjacent properties into a proposed 18" reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) stormdrain. The stormdrain will replace an existing wooden "trough" in order to properly convey stormwater during rain events and runoff from Sweetwater Road.

Caltrans will construct a bridge over the Sweetwater River within Segment 1 as part of the mitigation requirements for the SR 125 Extension Project.

Segment 1a

Segment 1a begins east of the Bonita Road Bridge and continues east along an existing trail at the southern boundary of the Bonita Golf Course to Conduit Road. This segment is approximately 3,379 feet in length and links the northern and southern portions of the loop trail to existing trails (formal and informal) to the west. The trail tread for this segment will be 8 feet to 10 feet wide within a 24-foot wide trail easement.

Drainage improvements required for this segment include installation of an 8" RCP culvert under the trail, associated head wall, catch basin and rip rap energy dissipator in order to convey nuisance flow from the adjacent homes to the south.

Segment 2

Segment 2 begins at the terminus of Segment 1 and ends at Segment 3. This segment is approximately 550 feet in length and. Segment 2 will be constructed by Caltrans as part of the mitigation requirements for the SR 125 Extension Project; therefore, it is not analyzed as part of this project.

Segment 3

Segment 3 begins at Quarry Road approximately one mile northeast of the intersection of Quarry Road and Sweetwater Road and is approximately 220 feet long. This segment consists largely of a bridge over Spring Valley Creek that will connect Segment 2 and Segment 5. The pedestrian/equestrian bridge will be approximately 10 feet wide by 200 feet long. The bridge will be capable of carrying multiple equestrian riders. The bridge will be connected to Segment 5 via a short trail segment 10 feet wide and 20 feet long. A profile of the bridge for this segment is shown in *Figure 4*.

Segment 4

Segment 4 begins at the terminus of Segment 2 and ends at the beginning of Segment 5 (approximately 60 feet southwest of Segment 3) and is approximately 5,600 feet in length. Caltrans will construct the first 550 feet of this segment as part of the mitigation requirements for the SR 125 Extension Project. Along a portion of Segment 4 closest to the Sweetwater Dam, the trail will utilize the existing San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) easement on Sweetwater Authority property that is currently used as a maintenance road. For safety reasons, the trail tread in this area will be widened to 16 feet with a 28-foot turnout to accommodate trail users, Sweetwater Authority vehicles, and SDCWA maintenance vehicles. Signs will be posted along the trail alerting users of possible truck traffic in this area. Convex mirrors may be added if warranted.

Near the southern portion of this segment, an 18" RCP drainage pipe, wing walls at the inlet and outlet, as well as a rip rap energy dissipator will be constructed to

convey water in this section under the trail. The trail itself will be constructed as a raised causeway approximately 650 feet in length.

Segment 5

Segment 5 begins at the terminus of Segment 4 (approximately 50 feet southwest of the terminus of Segment 3) and is approximately 1,640 feet in length. The trail will be 10 feet wide within a 20-foot wide trail easement.

Drainage facilities to be constructed as part of this segment include an 18" RCP culvert under the trail, associated wing walls, and a drainage ditch along the south side of the trail located approximately 300 feet east of the intersection of Segment 3 and Segment 5. The drainage ditch will convey water on the south side of the trail toward the new culvert.

Segment 6

Segment 6 will begin on the east side of Lakeview Avenue and travel in an eastwardly direction for approximately 4,121 feet along an existing trail. Segment 6 will consist of a 10-foot wide trail within a 20-foot wide trail easement.

Drainage improvements will consist of installation of two crossings traversing areas of disturbed freshwater marsh. The crossings will require the installation of culverts under the trail to allow for proper stormwater conveyance.

Segment 7

Segment 7 begins at the northeastern terminus of Segment 6. It runs parallel to the existing residential development and intersects with Sweetwater Authority property at the beginning of Segment 8. Segment 7 will consist of a 10-foot wide trail within a 20-foot wide trail easement.

Drainage improvements will include installation of one crossing. The crossing will require installation of a culvert under the trail for proper water conveyance.

Segment 8

Segment 8 begins at the terminus of Segment 7. . The entire segment is located on lands owned by the Sweetwater Authority. The segment follows the

northeastern boundary of the Sweetwater Reservoir and parallels Jamacha Road for approximately 5,026 feet along an existing trail and terminates at the Sweetwater Authority's eastern property line with the Pointe Development. The trail width will be 8 to 10 feet wide within a 20-foot wide easement. The trail tread along a portion of the segment may be reduced to 4 feet to accommodate the Sweetwater Authority's fence.

The existing chain-link fence along the Sweetwater Authority property will be removed and set back from its existing location. The trail will continue along Sweetwater Authority property. A lodge pole fence system will be constructed on the opposite side of the trail to serve as a directional guide for users. The fence will separate trail users from construction and maintenance traffic, as well as the Urban Runoff Diversion System (URDS) and Sweetwater Reservoir.

Drainage improvements will consist of installation/improvement of two crossings across areas of disturbed freshwater marsh. One crossing will require installation of a culvert under the trail to allow for proper stormwater conveyance. The second crossing will be the extension of an existing culvert.

Segment 9

Segment 9 will be constructed by the Pointe Development; therefore, it is not analyzed as part of this project.

Segment 10

Segment 10 will be constructed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) San Diego National Wildlife Refuge; therefore, it is not analyzed as part of this project. Segment 10 would ultimately connect to the existing trail on the south side of the reservoir (southern portion) and terminate at the Sweetwater Summit Regional Park, completing the loop around the Sweetwater Reservoir.

Staging Area 1

Staging Area 1 is an existing facility located within the County's Sweetwater Summit Regional Park and accessed at the end of Red Hill Trail. The staging area is equipped with all the necessary amenities.

Staging Area 2

Staging Area 2 is currently a vacant lot located near the intersection of Lakeview Avenue and Quarry Road. Staging Area 2 will require the installation of facilities such as parking, bathroom and drinking water facilities, trash receptacles, equestrian hitching posts, and benches.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail Project is surrounded by developed residential uses to the north and open space parks to the south. The southwest area of the loop trail system travels through Sweetwater Regional County Park, owned and maintained by the County. The Sweetwater River is located to the east and west of the reservoir, and Spring Valley Creek is located on the northwest side of the reservoir. Segment 1a is situated within recreation and residential uses.

The northern segments of the loop trail transverse a variety of vegetation communities. Vegetation/habitat types include: coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland, eucalyptus woodland, maritime succulent scrub, freshwater marsh, southern willow scrub, and mule fat scrub.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
State Highway Encroachment Permit	Caltrans
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1602 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)
General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB
Joint Use Agreement	San Diego County Water Authority
Irrevocable Easement	Sweetwater Authority
Domestic Water Supply Permit Amendment	CA Dept. of Public Health (CDPH)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Esther Daigneault
Printed Name

August 20, 2008

Date

Environmental Planning Manager
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. Based on a site visit completed by ESU staff, the proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The project site is located north of the Sweetwater Reservoir. The proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine cumulative effects. (Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a complete list of the projects considered.) Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project and other nearby projects do not involve substantial modification of the existing landforms or the blockage of views. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

No Impact: Based on a site visit completed by ESU staff, the proposed project is not located near or visible from the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The project site is the establishment and formalization of the northern portion of the Sweetwater Loop Trail and a trail segment that links the Sweetwater Loop Trail to existing trails to the west. The project site is located along the northern boundaries of the Sweetwater Reservoir and is not visible from a state scenic highway. The proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the

viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings can be characterized as developed/residential uses to the north, open space parks to the south, and recreational uses to the west. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality. The construction of the northern portion will provide a continuous non-motorized recreational loop around the Sweetwater Reservoir that links to existing trails to the west. The viewshed contributes to the appeal of the trail system and will not be changed with the establishment of a trail at this site.

The project proposes to utilize the existing trail tread to the fullest extent practicable. The trail is designed to sheet flow runoff toward the proposed BMPs (ie. vegetated buffer strip and gravel gutter) to prevent rills and erosion. Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements, installation of BMPs, and the abutments for the pedestrian/equestrian bridge in Segment 3. No large structures are proposed that would interfere with the visual character of the site. Impacts on the existing visual quality and character of the project site will be less than significant.

The entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine potential cumulative impacts to visual quality and character. (Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a complete list of the projects considered.) Visual impacts associated with the proposed project and other projects within the cumulative study area are expected to be temporary impacts related to construction activities. No permanent damage to scenic resources is expected. Once construction is complete, all equipment and related construction materials will be removed and the visual scene would return to its current state. The temporary impacts would affect few viewers, and impacts to visual quality would be less than significant.

The project proposes the establishment of a trail along the banks of the Sweetwater Reservoir. The existing viewshed contributes to the beauty of the trail system. The project does not propose any large scale grading, significant alteration of an existing landform, or development on steep slopes. Visual impacts from the proposed project and other projects in the cumulative study area are expected to result in an improved visual quality and character of the area after project completion. The combined impacts on visual character or quality of the proposed project and the projects within the cumulative study area would not be considered significant.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 36 miles from the Mt. Laguna Observatory. The project does not proposed any lighting; however if lighting is proposed in the future, it will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights; therefore, project implementation is not expected to adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations. Impacts will be less than significant.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project, in combination with all past, present and future projects in the area, will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

In addition to the requirements outlined in the Light Pollution Code, the proposed project will control outdoor lighting and sources of glare as follows:

1. The project will not install outdoor lighting that directly illuminates neighboring properties.

2. The project will not install outdoor lighting that would cast a direct beam angle toward a potential observer, such as a motorist, cyclist or pedestrian.
3. The project will not install outdoor lighting for vertical surfaces such as buildings, landscaping, or signs in a manner that would result in useful light or spill light being cast beyond the boundaries of the intended area to be lit.
4. The project will not install any highly reflective surfaces such as glare-producing glass or high-gloss surface color that will be visible along roadways, pedestrian walkways, or in the line of sight of adjacent properties.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (2004), the project site is not located within an area designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. A portion of the project site (Segment 8) includes lands designated as Farmland of Local Importance, however. Based on a site visit and a review of historic aerial photography, there is no evidence of agricultural use on the project site since 1997. Due to the lack of historic agricultural use at the project site, the site does not meet the definition of an agricultural resource and no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Portions of the project site are zoned A70, which is an agricultural zone. The proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, however, because a recreational trail is a permitted use in A70 and S80 zones. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The surrounding area within a 1-mile radius of the project site has land designated for agricultural uses. The proposed project will not, however, result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use. The project site does not contain any agricultural operations; therefore, the project will not restrict or interfere with existing operations. The proposed project includes establishing and formalizing the northern portion of the Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail, connecting the existing southern portion of the trail so as to eventually allow for non-motorized, recreational opportunities around the entire Sweetwater Reservoir. The proposed recreational trail would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use or result in a cumulative considerable impact to agricultural resources.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located within the San Diego Air Basin and subject to the land use/growth assumptions and air pollution control measures incorporated into the Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS). Operation of the project will not result in an increase of criteria pollutant emissions compared to the existing uses of the subject area as previously anticipated by the RAQS. The project's impact on the regional air quality plan would be less than significant. The project will not emit toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. The project will therefore not conflict or obstruct with the implementation of the RAQS nor the SIP.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality impacts from land use projects are generally the result of emissions from motor vehicles and short-term construction-related activities. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality.

APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs); therefore, the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used. However, the eastern portions of the county have atmospheric conditions that are characteristic of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB). SEDAB is not classified as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone and therefore has a less restrictive screening-level. Projects located in the eastern portions of the County can use the SEDAB screening-level threshold for VOCs.

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will result in temporary air quality impacts from construction-related activities and vehicle emissions. Such activities could result in temporary emissions of PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x, CO, and VOCs. Impacts from the proposed project would be reduced through standard construction measures to control airborne dust generation and excessive vehicle emissions. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

During construction and grading, incremental air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to any existing or projected air quality violation. Once construction is complete, the air quality environment at the project site is expected to be similar to existing conditions. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less Than Significant Impact: A list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects are expected to emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. (Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a complete list of the projects considered.) During construction and grading, incremental air pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project and cumulative projects are not expected to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to any existing or projected air quality violation. Once construction of each project is complete, the air quality environment at each site is expected to be similar to existing conditions. The proposed project and other projects in the cumulative study area would not contribute to long-term cumulative impacts to air quality. Overall, the incremental impact of the proposed project, when combined with the impacts of other projects in the area, is not considered cumulatively considerable.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes

in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors as they house children and the elderly.

No Impact: Based on site visits conducted by ESU Staff, sensitive receptors and point sources of toxic emissions have not been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. Furthermore, no point-source emissions of air pollutants (other than vehicle emissions) are associated with the project. As such, the project is not expected to expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. The construction of the proposed project could generate fumes from the operation of construction equipment which may be considered objectionable by some people. Such exposures would be short-term and/or transient as any fumes are expected to occur during construction only. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

An analysis of the biological resources in the project area and potential impacts to these resources is based on the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, site visits by the County's Environmental Services Unit (ESU) staff, and a Biological Resources Report prepared by Mooney Jones and Stokes (July 2008).

Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Although the project site supports native biological habitat, the removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects with mitigation incorporated, either directly or through habitat modifications, to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

As described below, the proposed project would result in direct and indirect impacts to biological resources within and adjacent to the project area. Direct impacts would result as a result of habitat removal for widening of existing paths for the trail segments and drainage crossings. Indirect impacts to biological resources may result from construction-related activities (i.e. noise, dust); however, these potential indirect impacts will be minimized through trail design. Project design features include the use of signs, fencing where appropriate, and educational information to ensure trail users recognize the presence and sensitivity of biological resources adjacent to the proposed trail. In addition, trail segments for the proposed project will use existing dirt paths when possible. Trail routes were selected to avoid and minimize potential impacts to streambeds and sensitive vegetation to the maximum extent practicable.

The following design measures are incorporated into the proposed project and will serve to avoid and minimize impacts to biological resources:

- Prior to the start of construction, all construction and staging area limits will be clearly identified with orange construction fencing to ensure that construction activities remain within the defined construction limits. A qualified biologist will inspect the fencing prior to the start of construction and shall monitor activities during construction to avoid unauthorized impacts.
- During construction, all construction activities, including, but not limited to, equipment storage, equipment cleaning, and stock piling, will occur within the identified orange construction areas. All storage areas will be protected with the

use of fiber rolls and/or silt fences. All construction staging areas shall be identified on site and construction plans.

- Natural drainage patterns will be maintained to the extent practicable during construction activities. Erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, hay bales, and/or the installation of sediment traps, will be incorporated into the erosion control plan for the proposed project.
- Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction activities which include, but are not limited to, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls shall be used to minimize surface transport of sediments. The construction contractor will be required to prepare and implement a *Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan* (SWPPP). The implementation of BMPs as stated in the contract and SWPP would reduce water quality impacts to below a level of significance.
- The use of motorized vehicles on trails shall be prohibited, except for wheelchairs, maintenance and emergency vehicles.
- Physical and/or visual barriers shall be incorporated to protect sensitive habitats, sensitive species, and wetland habitats by directing users to designated trails using natural vegetation, topography, limited fencing, trail makers, and signage.
- Foot traffic, equestrian activity, and bicycling are allowed only on designated trails.
- Dogs must be leashed at all times and are restricted to designated trails.
- To prevent potential dust damage to vegetation in the conserved habitat, spraying of the construction site with water shall be conducted on an as-needed basis.
- Hunting of animals or waterfowl is prohibited.
- The release or transplantation of non-native animals, fish, or vegetation is prohibited. No collection of plants, plant material, wildlife, or historical artifacts is allowed.

- Trail lighting should not be permitted within wildlife habitat except where essential for roadways, facility use, and safety. Lighting within wildlife habitat or along its edges should be limited to low pressure sodium sources directed away and shielded from wildlife habitat.
- Trails will be 8 to 10 feet wide; however, trails proposed adjacent to areas of sensitive habitat, wetland habitats or wetland buffers shall be no greater than 4 feet wide.

Sensitive vegetation communities identified within the project footprint include eucalyptus woodland, giant reed, non-native grassland, Diegan coastal sage scrub, maritime succulent scrub, freshwater marsh, and southern willow scrub, and mulefat scrub. Land covers on the project site include developed land and ornamental plantings. As shown in Table 1 below, direct impacts to these sensitive vegetation communities and land covers will occur as a result of trail improvements within Segments 1, 1a, 3 through 8, and Staging Area 2.

Table 1. Vegetation Impacts and Required Mitigation						
Habitat	Total Onsite (ac)	Inside MSCP (ac)	Outside MSCP (ac)	Total Impacts (ac)	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Required (ac)
Mule-fat Scrub	1.19	1.19	0.0	0.00	N/A	N/A
Southern Willow Scrub	4.77	2.97	1.8	1.07	3:1	3.21
Freshwater Marsh	0.828	0.098	0.73	0.15	2:1	0.30
Maritime Succulent Scrub	2.94	0.21	2.73	0.13	2:1	0.26
Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub	8.32	6.04	2.28	1.24	1.5:1	1.86
Non-native Grassland	21.16	3.36	17.8	7.12	0.5:1	3.56
Eucalyptus Woodland	0.86	0.44	0.42	0.23	N/A	N/A
Developed	28.25	16.66	11.59	7.15	N/A	N/A
Ornamental	5.75	5.49	0.26	0.76	N/A	N/A
Giant Reed	0.17	0.17	0.0	0.03	N/A	N/A
Total	74.238	37.61	36.628	14.5	-	8.255

Mitigation is required to reduce the impacts identified in Table 1 above to below a level of significance. Impacts to sensitive habitat types will be mitigated in conformance with the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO). Impacts to Diegan coastal sage scrub (a Tier II habitat) will be mitigated at a ratio of 1.5:1, totaling 1.86 acres. Impacts to non-native

grasslands (Tier III habitat) will be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio, totaling 3.56 acres. Impacts to freshwater marsh (a Tier I habitat) will be mitigated at a ratio of 2:1, totaling 0.30 acre. Impacts to disturbed southern willow scrub and maritime succulent scrub (Tier I habitats) will be mitigated at 3:1 and 2:1 ratios, respectively, totaling 3.21 acres for southern willow scrub and 0.26 acre for maritime succulent scrub. Mitigation is not required for impacts to eucalyptus woodland, giant reed, ornamental landscaping, and developed lands.

Mitigation for impacts identified in Table 1 above is proposed as follows:

1. Impacts to disturbed coastal sage scrub will be mitigated through deduction of 1.86 acre coastal sage scrub credits at the County's Rancho San Diego Mitigation Bank (1.5:1 ratio).
2. Impacts to southern willow scrub and freshwater marsh will be mitigated through restoration and enhancement of 3.51 acres of Spring Valley Creek (3:1 and 2:1 respectively). Portions of Spring Valley Creek that are east and south of Quarry Road are covered with dense stands of Giant Reed (*Arundo donax*) and Canary Island date (*Phoenix canariensis*) and Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*) trees; which have removed much of the biological value of the creek. Restoration and enhancement will consist of removal of non-native species and replanting with native riparian species.
3. Impacts to 0.13 acre of maritime succulent scrub will be mitigated through preservation of 0.26 acre of maritime succulent scrub at a County approved mitigation bank. Alternatively, mitigation may consist of restoration of 0.26 acre of maritime succulent scrub within the Sweetwater Valley Regional Park.
4. Impacts to 7.12 acres of non-native grasslands will be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio. Credits totaling 3.56 acres will be deducted from the County of San Diego Rancho San Diego Mitigation Bank.

Four sensitive plant species were identified within the project area: California adolphia, San Diego barrel cactus, Otay tarplant, and San Diego viguiera. The proposed trail project will not result in direct impacts to these sensitive plant species.

Five sensitive animal species were identified within or adjacent to the project area: coastal California gnatcatcher, coastal cactus wren, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, orange-throated whiptail, and least Bell's vireo. No southwestern willow flycatchers or

arroyo toads were observed along the proposed trail segments around the reservoir. Protocol surveys for Quino checkerspot butterfly were performed to determine presence/absence of this species. Survey results were negative.

Impacts to these sensitive wildlife species would be limited to the loss of a small amount of suitable habitat. Most of the proposed trail system will be located in previously disturbed areas; however, potential impacts to these species through loss of habitat would occur. Due to the limited impacts to suitable habitat, habitat-based mitigation beyond that summarized in Table 1 above is not proposed.

Direct impacts could also occur to least Bell's vireo, coastal California gnatcatcher, and coastal cactus wren if vegetation removal or grading is conducted during the breeding season of these species (February 1 to September 15 of any year). In order to mitigate for this impact, vegetation removal, trail grading, and construction is restricted during the breeding season within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) of natural habitat for types of raptors, California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and other migratory birds. If a qualified biologist determines that no nesting birds are within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors), construction may proceed with written concurrence from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Biological monitoring is required during construction to evaluate the potential for indirect impacts to raptors, migratory birds, and other sensitive biological resources on site.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Construction of the proposed northern trail segments will require drainage crossings over several named and unnamed drainages under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Direct impacts include 1.07 acres of disturbed southern willow scrub and 0.15 acre of freshwater marsh habitat. The project has been designed to minimize impacts to wetland and riparian habitats to the maximum extent practicable as

described in Section IV(a). Table 2 below provides a summary of jurisdictional impacts by trail segment. Impacts to jurisdictional resources would be considered significant, however, and will require mitigation. Mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional resources will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio. Refer to Table 2 below for a summary of jurisdictional impacts and required mitigation.

Table 2. Total Jurisdictional Impacts and Required Mitigation by Segment					
Segment	CDFG Impacts (acre)	ACOE Impacts (acre)	Total Impacts (acre)	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Requirement (acre)
1	0.01	0.01	0.01	2:1	0.02
1a	0.0	0.0	0.0	2:1	–
3	0.15	0.15	0.15	2:1	0.30
4	0.78	0.78	0.78	2:1	1.56
5	0.14	0.14	0.14	2:1	0.28
6	0.12	0.12	0.12	2:1	0.24
7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2:1	–
8	0.08	0.08	0.08	2:1	0.16
Total	1.28	1.28	1.28		2.56

In addition, the County will apply for permits to address these permanent and temporary impacts. These permits include a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFG, a 404 Nationwide Permit from the ACOE, and a 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

In addition to wetland and riparian impacts, the project will result in impacts to sensitive upland habitats communities, including disturbed coastal sage scrub, maritime succulent scrub and non-native grassland. Impacts to disturbed coastal sage scrub will be mitigated through deduction of 1.86 acre coastal sage scrub credits at the County's Rancho San Diego Mitigation Bank (1.5:1 ratio). Impacts to maritime succulent scrub will be mitigated through preservation of 0.26 acre of maritime succulent scrub at a County approved mitigation bank or through restoration of 0.26 acre within the Sweetwater Regional Park (2:1 ratio). Impacts to non-native grasslands will be mitigated through deduction of 3.56 acres of non-native grassland credits from the County's Rancho San Diego Mitigation Bank (0.5:1 ratio). Indirect impacts to coastal sage scrub communities adjacent to the proposed trail would be limited due to the project design features including the use of signs, and lodge pole directional fencing where needed to ensure that trail users recognize that the biological resources adjacent to the proposed trail alignment are sensitive. Refer to Table 1 for a summary of impacts and required mitigation for sensitive upland habitat communities.

Impacts to southern willow scrub and freshwater marsh will be mitigated through restoration and enhancement of 3.51 acres of Spring Valley Creek (3:1 and 2:1 ratio, respectively). Portions of Spring Valley Creek that are east and south of Quarry Road are covered with dense stands of Giant Reed (*Arundo donax*) and Canary Island date (*Phoenix canariensis*) and Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*) trees; which have removed much of the biological value of the creek. Restoration and enhancement will consist of removal of non-native species and replanting with native riparian species.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Construction of the proposed northern trail segments will require drainage crossings or installation of drainage facilities for proper stormwater conveyance, resulting in impacts to drainage features under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Mitigation for impacts to jurisdictional resources will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio as described in question IV(b) above. Refer to Table 2 for a summary of jurisdictional impacts and mitigation requirements by trail segment.

As described above, the County will obtain all required permits to address temporary and permanent impacts to jurisdictional resources. Required permits include a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFG, a 404 Nationwide Permit from the ACOE, and a 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).

After implementation of required mitigation and approval of required permits, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, and the use of native wildlife nursery sites would not be expected as a result of the proposed project. The Sweetwater Reservoir and surrounding natural habitats provide habitat to many sensitive plant and animal species and provide connection to undeveloped portions of eastern San Diego County. The project does not, however, propose any structures or other barriers that may impede the use of the site as a wildlife corridor. In addition, the project proposes to utilize the existing disturbed areas to the maximum extent practicable without removing sensitive habitats. Fences will be used to direct users to the designated trails. The fences will be designed and located in areas as not to impede wildlife movement. The site will continue to provide habitat connectivity post construction. Furthermore, the proposed project will not impede the use of the site as a wildlife corridor or interfere with the movement of native species.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The majority of the proposed trail is located within the boundaries of the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The project has been found to

conform to the requirements of this program. Refer to the MSCP Findings, dated August 2008, for information and substantiation of compliance.

Portions of the proposed trail are located outside the boundaries of the MSCP. Segments 4-8 are located on lands owned by the Sweetwater Authority (SWA). Water district lands were not included within the County's MSCP Subarea Plan. The project will result in impacts to CSS on Segments 4 and 6. The County will obtain Take Authorization through the County's Habitat Loss Permit process. Refer to the Habitat Loss Permit Findings, dated July 14, 2008, for information and substantiation of compliance.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Glenn Russell, on January 6, 2005, no impacts to historical resources are expected because they do not occur within the project site.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A preliminary institutional records search was conducted at the South Coast Information Center of the California Historic Resources File System at San Diego State University to identify any previously recorded sites in the area of the proposed Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail. Based on the record

search, it was determined that the project area had previously been surveyed and nine prehistoric sites were identified.

The project area was resurveyed and all previously identified sites were reevaluated by County staff archaeologist, Glenn Russell, on January 26, 2005. Of the nine previously identified sites, scattered artifacts were found at CA SDi 4769, CA SDi 4771, CA SDi 4645, CA SDi 6843, CA SDi 10994, and CA SDi 4770. No artifacts could be found at CA SDi 4773 and CA SDi 7978. Surveys were not conducted at CA SDi 4772 because the site is outside the project limits. If the project boundary were extended, CA SDi 4772 would be reevaluated at that time. Excavation of the nine previously recorded sites would not contribute to the understanding of local, regional, state or national history or prehistory and are therefore determined not to be significant.

As part of the investigation by Dr. Russell, one new site was located. This site consisted of low-density lithic scatter and is probably characterized as a minor quarry location for metavolcanic cobbles. Although relatively few pieces of debitage were present the site was determined not to be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources. In addition the construction of the trail will have no impact on the site.

A separate archaeological investigation was conducted for Segment 1a by ICF Jones and Stokes archaeologist, William Eckhardt, in January 2008. Segment 1a is located between Conduit Road and the Bonita Road Bridge, adjacent to the southern boundary of the Bonita Golf Course. As a result of a pedestrian reconnaissance, the survey determined that cultural materials were present within or adjacent to Segment 1a. These materials include marine shell, a lithic flake, and small fragments of historic refuse. The Negative Cultural Resources Report for the Sweetwater Loop Trail Project, prepared by ICF Jones & Stokes (April 2008) evaluated the significance of the archaeological resources based on subsurface testing, analysis of recovered artifacts, and other investigations. The study concluded that the archaeological resource(s) are not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5.

The results of the archaeological investigations summarized above were provided in the Sweetwater Loop Trail Archaeological Study prepared for the proposed project by Glenn Russell (June 2005). The study identified the significance of the archaeological resources on the project site and concluded that the archaeological resource(s) were not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. If resources are not considered significant archaeological resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5, loss of these resources cannot

contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. In addition, the proposed loop trail project will establish trails along currently non-designated existing disturbed trails, paths and roadways wherever feasible and does not propose any grading activities in the location of the previously identified archaeological sites. Impacts are less than significant.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Unique geologic features are those that are unique to the field of geology. Unique geologic features are not common in San Diego; however, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County. Adverse impacts to unique geologic features typically include material impairment through the destruction, permanent covering, or alteration of the feature. An indirect impact includes the loss of geologic history and any associated scientific value or characteristic changes to a community that results from destruction of the unique geologic environment.

No Impact: The project site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. In addition, the project site does not meet the significance criteria listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geologic Features (July 2007).

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations

indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. The project has high potential for containing paleontological resources and will excavate less than 2,500 cubic yards of the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. An impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed; therefore, monitoring will take place during excavation is implemented to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to below a level of significance.

A monitoring program implemented by the excavation/grading contractor will be required. Equipment operators and others involved in the excavation should watch for fossils during the normal course of their duties. In accordance with the Grading Ordinance, if a fossil or fossil assemblage of greater than twelve inches in any dimension is encountered during excavation, all excavation operations in the area where the fossil or fossil assemblage was found shall be suspended immediately, the County's Permit Compliance Coordinator shall be notified, and a Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to inspect the find to determine if it is significant. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Land Use Director:

- A Ph.D. or M.S. or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology, etc.);
- Demonstrated knowledge of southern California paleontology and geology; and
- Documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented. If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Department of Planning and Land Use identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found. If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their

paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

Implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations would reduce any potential impacts to paleontological resources to below a level of significance. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas will be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other projects that propose significant grading would be subject to the regulations for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. The project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Glenn Russell, on January 26, 2005, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The Negative Cultural Resources Report for the Sweetwater Loop Trail Project, prepared by ICF Jones & Stokes (April 2008) evaluated the significance of the archaeological resources based on subsurface testing, analysis of recovered artifacts, and other investigations. The study concluded that the archaeological resource(s) are not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. The results of the two survey are included in an archaeological survey report entitled, Sweetwater Loop Trail Archaeological Survey Report, prepared by Glenn Russell (June 2005). The survey report evaluated the significance of the archaeological resources on the project site and concluded that the archaeological resources are not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. No geologic impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone will result from implementation of the proposed project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to establish and formalize the northern portion of the Sweetwater Loop Trail. The project includes installation of a pedestrian/equestrian bridge over Spring Valley Creek. To ensure the structural integrity of the bridge and any other structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. A geotechnical investigation will be completed prior to installation of the bridge in order to verify that the geology of the site is suitable for the bridge. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code will ensure that the project will not result in a potentially

significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A portion of the project site (Segment 1a) is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. No structures are proposed as part of the project, however. The potential to expose people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction, is therefore minimal and less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geological Hazards (July 2007). Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. As the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have

no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Auld clad, Diablo clay (9-15 percent slope), Diablo clay (15-30percent slope), Huerhuero-Urban land complex, Linne clay loam, Riverwash, Tujunga sand, Olivenhain cobbly loam, San Miguel-Exchequer Rocky silt loams, and San Miguel rocky silt loams that have a soil erodibility rating of “moderate” and/or “severe” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons The project will utilize existing trail treads to the maximum extent practicable. Trails will be 8-10 feet wide and 4 feet wide in areas of sensitive habitat. The project will avoid the removal of mature vegetation and will only remove those stumps, boulders, and roots that interfere with safe passage

Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements, installation of BMPs, and the abutments for the pedestrian/equestrian bridge in Segment 3. Grading and construction activities within and adjacent to the existing drainages on site have the potential to cause soil erosion and sedimentation, which may result in increased rates of surface runoff, decreased water quality, and related environmental damage, if appropriate erosion and sedimentation control measures are not implemented. Natural drainage patterns will be maintained to the extent practicable during construction activities. An erosion control plan will be implemented with erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, hay bales, and/or the installation of sediment traps, to control erosion. Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction activities which include, but are not limited to, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls shall be used to minimize surface transport of sediments.

The project proposes to utilize the existing trail tread to the fullest extent practicable. The trail will be designed to ensure runoff sheet flows toward proposed BMPs (i.e. vegetated buffer strip and gravel gutter) to prevent rills and erosion. The trail will be periodically re-graded to prevent rills from forming, to promote sheet flow, and to reduce erosion. The re-grading will be on an as-needed basis, but a minimum of one time per year at the end of the rainy season. An effective combination of site control, source control, and treatment control Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented as part of the project.

The project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion. The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a complete list of the projects considered.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. On a site visit

conducted by ESU Staff, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a (i) through (iv) above.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on site are Auld clay, Diablo clay (9-15 percent slope), Diablo clay (15-30percent slope), Huerhuero-Urban land complex, Linne clay loam, Riverwash, Tujunga sand, Olivenhain cobbly loam, San Miguel-Exchequer Rocky silt loams, and San Miguel rocky silt loams. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. In addition the project does not propose the construction of any structures.

The project will not create a substantial risk to life or property due to expansive soils. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is the establishment and formalization of the northern portion of the Sweetwater Loop Trail and a trail segment that will link the complete loop trail to

existing trails to the west. The project does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems as no wastewater will be generated.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Mitigation Incorporated	Unless <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of hazardous substances. There are no hazardous substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint, or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact:

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known

to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been identified as subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill; is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash); is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS); does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank; and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface, or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. The project will therefore not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the

statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and unincorporated areas of the County. The project will not interfere with this plan as it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of the existing plan from being implemented.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The project will not interfere with or impair implementation of the San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan due to the location of the project and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. The land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the County's jurisdiction; therefore, the proposed project, which is located in the unincorporated area of the County, is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation plan for nuclear power stations.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The proposed project will not interfere with or impair implementation of the Oil Spill Contingency Element as the project is not located within the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The proposed project will not interfere with or impair implementation of the Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan as the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not interfere with or impair implementation of the Dam Evacuation Plan for the Sweetwater Dam. Even though the

project is located within a dam inundation zone, the project is not a unique institution that would be difficult to safely evacuate in the event of a dam failure. Unique institutions, as defined by the Office of Emergency Services, include hospitals, schools, skilled nursing facilities, retirement homes, mental health care facilities, care facilities for patients with disabilities, adult and childcare facilities, jails/detention facilities, stadiums, arenas, amphitheaters, or a similar use.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The loop trail project is surrounded by developed and residential uses to the north and open space parks to the south. The southwest area of the loop trail system goes through Sweetwater Regional County Park, owned and maintained by the County. The Sweetwater River is located to the east and west of the reservoir, and Spring Valley Creek lies on the northwest side of the reservoir. The proposed project is located on undeveloped lands adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires; however, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. In addition the trail tread will serve as fuel/fire break. Based on a review of the project by County staff, staff has determined that through compliance with the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact as all past, present and future projects are also required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more. The project does, however, involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, including equestrian trail uses, which would potentially expose people to significant risk related to vectors. In coordination with the County Department of Environmental Health, Vector Surveillance Program, County Department of Parks and Recreation will ensure that people are not exposed to vectors. Implementation of vector management measures are intended to ensure that the project will not expose people to significant risk of injury or death involving vectors or create cumulatively considerable impacts related to vectors.

Proposed Rules and Regulations for trail use include a requirement that pet owners must pick up after pets and dispose of any wastes offsite or in proper locations identified onsite. Signage will be posted in designated areas as appropriate and pet waste bags will be provided for owners at staging areas. Prior to opening the trail to public use, the County will contract with a licensed waste disposal facility to establish a schedule for waste removal. Horse manure will be removed from the trail on a weekly basis by County-contracted personnel. Storage containers will not be necessary as manure will be removed offsite immediately. The County may also investigate the use of manure in off-site composting operations as a less expensive alternative to the removal of waste to a disposal facility.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: As described in Section IV, Biological Resources, implementation of the proposed northern trail segments will result in impacts to resources under the jurisdiction of the ACOE, CDFG, and RWQCB. Required permits include 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The County will obtain all required permits prior to initiation of construction of the project.

Potential pollutants that may result from the trail improvement project and staging areas include sediment and soils released offsite during construction grading activities, trash and debris, potential fuel spillage, and nitrogen and phosphorous from horse manure. Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements, installation of BMPs, and the abutments for the pedestrian/equestrian bridge in Segment 3.

On January 24, 2007, the San Diego RWQCB adopted Order No. R9-2007-0001 for a new Municipal Stormwater Permit (MS4), which represents the second municipal permit issued to the San Diego County co-permittees. In compliance with the Municipal Stormwater Permit, the proposed project includes special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs), and treatment control BMPs. By incorporating appropriate design consideration and mitigation measures, the proposed project would be in compliance with all water quality standards and waste discharge requirements.

The following site design measures, source control and treatment control BMPs will be implemented to reduce potential pollutants in runoff:

Site and Source Control BMPs

- The location of the proposed trail will be set back at least 100 feet from the high water level of the reservoir.
- A 6-foot chain linked fence will continue to protect the Sweetwater Reservoir from recreational trail users. At no point along the trail will a user be located between the reservoir and the chain linked fence. Any barbed wire installed at the top of chain linked fences along the trail corridor will be positioned away from the trail to ensure safety of equestrian users.
- Some of the chemicals used in “treated” wood, such as arsenic, are not acceptable for use in close proximity to a drinking water reservoir. Sweetwater

Authority's Water Quality Department should review and approve the use of any "treated" construction materials.

- Horses will be prohibited from entering the reservoir or any stream within 200 feet of the reservoir shoreline. Chain link fencing will be installed along the perimeter of the trail to prevent entry to the reservoir.
- The trail will be designed to sheet flow runoff towards the proposed BMPs (i.e. vegetated buffer strip and gravel gutter) to prevent rills and erosion.
- The trail will be periodically re-graded, as needed, to prevent rills from forming, to promote sheet flow, and to reduce erosion. The re-grading will be on an as-needed basis, but a minimum of one time per year at the end of the rainy season.
- Trail Segment 8 (the portion of the trail on Sweetwater Authority property) is subject to closure, without notice, for maintenance or operational activities, or should Sweetwater Authority, or any other regulatory agency, determine the safety of the stored water is jeopardized.
- The Proposed Rules and Regulations for trail use will require pet owners to pick up after their pets and dispose of any wastes in a proper location on or off-site. Pet waste bags will be provided for owners at staging areas. Signage will also be posted in designated areas as appropriate.
- Prior to opening the trail to public use, the County will contract with a licensed waste disposal facility to establish a schedule for waste removal. Horse manure will be removed from the trail on a weekly basis by County-contracted personnel. Storage containers will not be necessary as the manure will be removed offsite immediately. The County may also investigate the use of manure in composting operations as a less expensive alternative to the removal of waste to a disposal facility.
- Daily inspections may be necessary before, during, and after rain or storm events to ensure the integrity of the trail system. Manure, trash, litter and debris will be removed in a timely manner prior to a rain or storm event. If necessary, trails will be closed during severe rain events. Temporary signage will be installed at trail heads, staging areas, and/or at the adjacent Sweetwater Summit Regional Park during inclement weather advising users of trail closures.

- Trail maintenance will be performed by County-contracted personnel or volunteers on an as-needed basis to pick up trash and debris, smooth the trail, and to trim vegetation..
- Trail brochures and signage, indicating the reservoir is a source of domestic water supply and should not be polluted, will be provided to educate the public and discourage any type of pollution.

Treatment Control BMPs

- In areas where the trail is between 10 feet and 25 feet from the Urban Runoff Diversion System (URDS), a 12-inch gravel gutter and vegetated buffer strip, with a slope less than 15% sloping towards the reservoir, will be installed along the shoreward edge of the trail. The buffer strip will trap sediment, nutrients, trash, and organics and prevent them from migrating towards the reservoir.
- In areas where the trail is less than 10 feet from the URDS, a 12-inch gravel gutter and vegetated buffer strip as stated above will apply. In addition, an impervious barrier, landscaping edging, will be installed as close to the URDS system as possible.

As part of the proposed project, an erosion control plan will be implemented with erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, hay bales, and/or the installation of sediment traps. In addition, Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction activities to avoid water quality impacts, polluted runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. BMPs include, but are not limited to, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls will be used to minimize surface transport of sediments. The construction contractor will be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies within the La Nacion (909.12) and Jamacha (909.21) hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit. Portions of this watershed are impaired for Coliform bacteria and metals; however, the project does not propose any known sources of pollutants or land use activities that might contribute to these specific pollutants.

Potential pollutants that may result from the trail improvement project and staging areas include sediment and soils released offsite during construction grading activities, trash and debris, potential fuel spillage, and nitrogen and phosphorous from horse manure. Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements, installation of BMPs, and the abutments for the pedestrian/equestrian bridge in Segment 3. The proposed project includes special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs), and treatment control BMPs. Refer to VIII (a) above for a summary of the site, source, and control BMPs that are included in the proposed project.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses or otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region, as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the La Nacion (909.12) and Jamacha (909.21) hydrologic subarea, within the Sweetwater hydrologic unit. The following are existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater

habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; and rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

Potential pollutants that may result from project implementation include sediment and soils that could be released offsite during construction grading activities, trash and debris, potential fuel spillage, and nitrogen and phosphorous from horse manure.. The trail is designed to sheet flow runoff toward the proposed BMPs (ie. vegetated buffer strip and gravel gutter) to prevent rills and erosion. Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements, installation of BMPs, and the abutments for the pedestrian/equestrian bridge in Segment 3. Site design measures, including source control BMP's and/or treatment control BMP's will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff.

As part of the proposed project, an erosion control plan will be implemented with erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, hay bales, and/or the installation of sediment traps. In addition, Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction activities to avoid water quality impacts, polluted runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. BMPs include, but are not limited to, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls will be used to minimize surface transport of sediments. The construction contractor will be required to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Implementation of BMPs as stated in contract documents and the SWPPP would reduce water quality impacts to below a level of significance.

The proposed project incorporates site design considerations and special treatment control BMPs due to the proximity to the Sweetwater Reservoir. At all locations, the trail will be set back at least 100 feet from the high water mark. In areas along the trail system where the trail tread is between 10 feet and 25 feet from the Urban Runoff Diversion System (URDS), a 12-inch gravel gutter and vegetated buffer strip, with a slope less than 15% sloping towards the reservoir, will be installed along the shoreward edge of the trail. The buffer strip will trap sediment, nutrients, trash, and organics and prevent them from migrating towards the reservoir. Runoff will flow into the gravel gutter and sheet flow onto the vegetated buffer strip. The vegetated buffer strip filters nutrients, trash, pathogens and sediment out of the runoff prior to entering the URDS. In areas where the trail is less than 10 feet from the URDS, a 12-inch gravel gutter and vegetated buffer strip as stated above will apply with the addition of the installation of an impervious landscaping edging as close to the URDS system as possible. The landscape edging prevents runoff from entering the URDS until it has been properly treated, via the vegetated buffer strip.

Surface runoff from the proposed Staging Area 2 located off of Lakeview Avenue would drain toward the nearest downstream surface water, the Sweetwater Reservoir. Materials spilled, deposited, or disposed of at the parking area of Staging Area 2 may be washed into the Sweetwater Reservoir, thereby impacting the quality of the surface water and associated beneficial uses. Petroleum hydrocarbons contained in fuel, oil, grease, lubricants, finishes, and cleansers may be spilled directly onto the parking lot at this staging area when fuel leaks from containers or fuel tanks. Debris and litter can accumulate in parking areas as well. Food and other wastes that are washed into the reservoir may increase algae and other odor causing vegetation. Trash, food, and other wastes may also contribute pathogens to the runoff deposited into the Sweetwater Reservoir. In order to reduce these water quality impacts to the Sweetwater Reservoir, drainage plans and runoff control plans for the staging area will be designed in consultation with the Sweetwater Authority.

Horses will be prohibited from entering the reservoir or any stream within 200 feet of the reservoir shoreline. Chain link fencing will be installed along the perimeter of the trail to prevent entry to the reservoir. The Proposed Rules and Regulations for trail use will require pet owners to pick up after their pets and dispose of any wastes in a proper location on or off-site. Pet waste bags will be provided for owners at staging areas. Signage will also be posted in designated areas as appropriate. Prior to opening the trail to public use, the County will contract with a licensed waste disposal facility to establish a schedule for waste removal. Horse manure will be removed from the trail on a weekly basis by County-contracted personnel. Storage containers will not be necessary as the manure will be removed offsite immediately. The County may also investigate the use of manure in off-site composting operations as a less expensive alternative to the removal of waste to a disposal facility.

Trail inspection and necessary maintenance will be performed by County personnel or volunteers on an as-needed basis to pick up trash and debris, smooth the trail, repair fences, and trim vegetation. Trail brochures and signage, indicating the reservoir is a source of domestic water supply and shall not be polluted, will be provided to educate the public and discourage any type of pollution. Location and distances to staging area trash and restroom facilities, commercial areas, and bus stops will be provided on signs and/or brochures.

The trail will be designed to ensure all runoff sheet flows toward the proposed BMPs. The trail will be periodically re-graded as needed, but a minimum of one time per year at the end of the rainy season, to prevent rills from forming, to promote sheet flow, and to

reduce erosion.

With the implementation of the BMPs described above, water quality impacts to the Sweetwater Reservoir would be reduced to below a level of significance. The proposed project would therefore not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not propose the use of groundwater for any purpose, including construction activities, irrigation, domestic or commercial water demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to, regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Construction of the proposed northern trail segments will require drainage crossings over several named and unnamed drainages under the

jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements, installation of BMPs, and the abutments for the pedestrian/equestrian bridge in Segment 3. Grading and construction activities within and adjacent to the existing drainages on site have the potential to cause soil erosion and sedimentation, which may result in increased rates of surface runoff, decreased water quality, and related environmental damage, if appropriate erosion and sedimentation control measures are not implemented. An erosion control plan will be implemented with erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, hay bales, and/or the installation of sediment traps, to control erosion. Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction activities which include, but are not limited to, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls shall be used to minimize surface transport of sediments.

Natural drainage patterns will be maintained to the extent practicable during construction activities. The project proposes to utilize the existing trail tread to the fullest extent practicable. The trail will be designed to ensure runoff sheet flows toward proposed BMPs (i.e. vegetated buffer strip and gravel gutter) to prevent rills and erosion. The trail will be periodically re-graded to prevent rills from forming, to promote sheet flow, and to reduce erosion. The re-grading will be on an as-needed basis, but a minimum of one time per year at the end of the rainy season. An effective combination of site control, source control, and treatment control Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented as part of the project.

The project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements, installation of BMPs, and the abutments for the pedestrian/equestrian bridge in Segment 3. Grading and construction activities within and adjacent to the existing drainages on site have the potential to cause soil erosion and sedimentation, which may result in increased rates of surface runoff, decreased water quality, and related environmental damage, if appropriate erosion and sedimentation control measures are not implemented. Natural drainage patterns will be maintained to the extent practicable during construction activities. An erosion control plan will be implemented with erosion control techniques, including the use of gravel bags, hay bales, and/or the installation of sediment traps, to control erosion. Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction activities which include, but are not limited to, storm drain inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance/exit areas, and silt fencing. Silt fences and fiber rolls shall be used to minimize surface transport of sediments.

The trail will be designed so that all runoff sheet flows toward the selected best management practices (BMPs). The trail will be periodically re-graded as needed, but a minimum of one time per year at the end of the rainy season, to prevent rills from forming, to promote sheet flow, and to reduce erosion. Through implementation of the design considerations and site control, source control, and treatment control BMPs, the project will not significantly increase the amount of runoff that would result in flooding on- or off- site.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The project will require installation of culverts to allow for proper stormwater conveyance under the trail.

Potential pollutants that may result from the trail improvement project and staging areas include sediment and soils released offsite during construction grading activities, trash and debris, potential fuel spillage, and nitrogen and phosphorous from horse manure. Grading will be required for improvements to the trail, including drainage improvements, installation of BMPs, and the abutments for the pedestrian/equestrian bridge in Segment 3. The proposed project includes site design measures, source control and treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants in runoff. These measures are summarized in VIII (a) above and described below.

The proposed project incorporates site design considerations intended to reduce potential pollutants in runoff and minimize impacts to water quality. At all locations, the proposed trail will be set back at least 100 feet from the high water level. Horses will be prohibited from entering the reservoir or any stream within 200 feet of the reservoir shoreline. Chain-link fencing will be installed along the perimeter of the trail to prevent entry to the reservoir. Daily inspections may be necessary before, during, and after rain or storm events to ensure the integrity of the trail system. Manure, trash, litter and debris will be removed in a timely manner prior to a rain or storm event. If necessary, trails will be closed during severe rain events. Temporary signage will be installed at trail heads, staging areas, and/or at the adjacent Sweetwater Summit Regional Park during inclement weather advising users of trail closures.

Proposed Rules and Regulations for trail use include a requirement that pet owners must pick up after pets and dispose of any wastes offsite or in proper locations identified onsite. Signage will be posted in designated areas as appropriate. Pet waste bags will be provided for owners at staging areas. Prior to opening the trail to public use, the County will contract with a licensed waste disposal facility to establish a schedule for waste removal. Horse manure will be removed from the trail on a weekly basis by County-contracted personnel. Storage containers will not be necessary as manure will be removed offsite immediately. The County may also investigate the use of manure in off-site composting operations as a less expensive alternative to the removal of waste to a disposal facility.

Trail inspection and necessary maintenance will be performed by County personnel or volunteers on an as-needed basis to pick up trash and debris, smooth the trail, repair fences, and trim vegetation. Trail brochures and signage, indicating the reservoir is a source of domestic water supply and should not be polluted, will be provided to educate the public and discourage any type of pollution. Location and distances to staging area

trash and restroom facilities, commercial areas, and bus stops will be provided on signs and/or brochures.

In areas along the trail system where the trail tread is between 10 feet and 25 feet from the Urban Runoff Diversion System (URDS), a 12-inch gravel gutter and vegetated buffer strip with a slope less than 15% toward the reservoir, will be installed along the shoreward edge of the trail. The buffer strip will trap sediment, nutrients, trash, and organics, and prevent these materials from migrating toward the reservoir or entering the URDS. Runoff will flow into the gravel gutter and sheet flow onto the vegetated buffer strip. In areas where the trail is less than 10 feet from the URDS, a 12-inch gravel gutter and vegetated strip as stated above will apply with the addition of an impervious landscaping edge as close to the URDS as possible. The landscape edging is designed to prevent runoff from entering the URDS until it has been properly treated via the vegetated buffer strip. Maintenance of the vegetated buffer strips would consist of mowing, irrigation if necessary, weeding, and litter removal. Maintenance of the gravel gutter will consist of an annual inspection and removal of sediment if necessary.

The trail will be designed to ensure runoff sheet flows toward proposed BMPs (i.e. vegetated buffer strip and gravel gutter) to prevent rills and erosion. The trail will be periodically re-graded to prevent rills from forming, to promote sheet flow, and to reduce erosion. The re-grading will be on an as-needed basis, but a minimum of one time per year at the end of the rainy season. The effective combination of site control, source control, and treatment control Best Management Practices (BMPs) described above is intended to protect the quality of water in the reservoir.

- h) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Drainage swales, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. The project is not proposing to place housing or structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas, however. In addition, the project will not place

access roads or other improvements in locations that will limit access during flood events or affect downstream properties.

- i) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site contains drainage swales, which are identified as being 100-year flood hazard areas. The project proposes to construct a bridge over Spring Valley Creek along the alignment of the Sweetwater Loop Trail. The bridge will transverse the 100-year flood plain, but will not impede or redirect flood flows in these areas.

- j) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The majority of the trail is located upstream of the Sweetwater Dam; however, a small portion of the project does lie within a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County, as identified on an inundation map prepared by the dam owner. After review of the inundation map for the Sweetwater Dam, it has been determined that the proposed project will not result in the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss injury, or death involving flooding as a result of failure of the Sweetwater Dam. Adequate emergency response time exists to warn people before the water would reach the site. In addition, the San Diego County of Disaster Preparedness has an established emergency evacuation plan for the area, which will not be impeded or impaired by the project.

k) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast and would therefore not be inundated in the event of a tsunami.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is a type of landslide. The project site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. The geologic environment of the project area is not located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, the project does propose land disturbance that will expose soils and the project is not located downstream from exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. The project is not anticipated to expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is intended to establish and formalize the northern portion of the Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail. The Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail Project is surrounded by developed residential uses to the north and open space parks to the south. The proposed project is consistent with adjacent land uses and would not divide the nearby residential areas or surrounding community. The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan/Zoning Map, as well as the goals and policies identified in the General Plan and applicable community plans. The project was developed and designed in correspondence with the County's Community Trail Master Plan. The Master Plan sets forth implementation strategies and design guidelines adopted for the purpose of avoiding and mitigating environmental effects. Furthermore, to procure necessary permits/approvals, the County has coordinated with the appropriate jurisdictions and agencies, including California Department of Fish and Game, US Army Corps of Engineers, US Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Health Services, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project, therefore, would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project area.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3).

The project site is surrounded by land uses including residential, recreational, and open space preserves, which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties including, but not limited to, noise, air quality, and traffic. Implementation of the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value as the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned A70 and S80, which are not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82). The project site does not have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000).

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on a site visit completed by ESU Staff, the surrounding area supports single-family residential land uses to the north and open space parks to the south. Primary users of the trail system would be hikers, bike riders and equestrians. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards as described below.

i. County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). The project will not, therefore, expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

ii. Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the proposed project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards because operation of the project does not involve any noise generating equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

iii. Noise Ordinance – Section 36.410

The project will not generate construction noise that exceeds the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. The construction of the trail is not expected to require extensive construction equipment, as the trail will utilize existing disturbed tread to the maximum extent practicable.

The project's compliance with the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.410) will ensure that the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive land uses and the applicable noise level limits at the property line or during construction. The project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

- Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
- Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.

- Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
- Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Increased noise levels may result from the proposed project due to increased users on the trail system. The low noise-producing activities (i.e. hiking, equestrian riding, and habitat watching) would not significantly impact the current noise environmental, however. The project would therefore not result in a substantial permanent increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would result in short-term noise impacts due to the use of mechanized and handheld equipment for construction and maintenance of the project, as well as construction vehicles entering and exiting the project site. Temporary increases in existing ambient noise levels for general

construction noise are expected to be in compliance with the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410), which are derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Although construction activities will result in noise impacts to the surrounding environment, these impacts will be temporary and will cease upon completion of construction and installation of the project. The short-term impact, in combination with existing regulations on hours of operation, will reduce the impacts to below a level of significance.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The project will therefore not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in the area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or indirectly encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions. In addition, the project does not propose the addition of homes or businesses that would directly result in population growth in the area.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to establish and formalize the northern portion of the Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail. The proposed project does not involve displacement of any existing housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve displacement of a substantial number of people as the site is currently vacant.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to improve and formalize the northern portion of the Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail, a portion of which is located on Sweetwater Authority property. The proposed project will connect to the existing southern portion so as to eventually allow non-motorized recreational opportunities completely around the Sweetwater Reservoir, a 14.1-mile loop trail. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including, but not limited to, fire protection facilities, police facilities, schools, or parks, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. The project will therefore not have an adverse physical effect on the environment as the project does not require the provision of new or significantly altered services or facilities.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is to improve and formalize and existing trail system surrounding the Sweetwater Reservoir, including a connection to existing trails to the west. The project is not expected to result in increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project involves new and/or expanded recreational facilities. The project proposes to establish and formalize the northern portion of the Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail. The proposed project will connect to the existing southern portion of the trail system so as to eventually allow for non-motorized recreational opportunities completely around the Sweetwater Reservoir, a 14.1-mile loop trail. As described in this Environmental Initial Study, the new and/or expanded facilities will not result in a significant adverse physical effect on the environment with mitigation measures implemented for biological resources, cultural resources, and water quality.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would result in a short-term increase in traffic during construction activities due to construction vehicles entering and exiting the project site. Increased daily trips during project construction is anticipated to result in less than significant impacts to existing traffic on adjacent roadways. In addition, implementation of the project may result in increased traffic to and from the project site due to increased use of the loop trail system and associated recreational facilities. The limited number of increased vehicle trips anticipated is not expected to cause a significant increase in traffic in relation to existing traffic loads, vehicle trips or volume to capacity ratio on roads. The short-term, periodic traffic resulting from construction activities and any increased traffic from use of the loop trail system is not expected to exceed the level of service (LOS) standards established by the County of San Diego for the circulation elements roads in the surrounding area. Impacts are considered less than significant.

The project proposes to establish and formalize the northern portion of the Sweetwater Reservoir Loop Trail and connect it to existing trails to the west. The proposed project will connect to the existing southern portion so as to allow non-motorized recreational opportunities completely around the Sweetwater Reservoir, a 14.1-mile loop trail. The increased trail connections would provide nearby residents with expanded access to the trail system from other trails in the area, thereby increasing non-vehicular mobility and potentially reducing congestion and vehicle trips.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose to generate a significant increase in average daily trips (ADTs) or exceed, either individually or cumulatively, the level of service (LOS) standards established by the County of San Diego. The short-term, periodic traffic resulting from construction activities and any increased traffic from use of the loop trail system are considered less than significant.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: Increased daily trips during project construction is anticipated to result in less than significant impacts to existing traffic volume on adjacent roadways; however, project construction could result in short-term impacts to circulation and temporary traffic-related hazards. A traffic control plan would be implemented as part of the project to manage traffic and circulation impacts associated with the proposed project during construction and maintenance activities, and to ensure that vehicular traffic and pedestrian/bicycle/equestrian traffic flows smoothly. The traffic control plan will include available access options, parking and construction staging areas, and construction phasing considerations.

Long-term operation of the proposed trail system will not alter traffic patterns on adjacent roadways and will improve the internal circulation around Sweetwater Reservoir. The increased trail connections would provide nearby residents with expanded access to the trail system from other trails in the area, thereby increasing non-vehicular mobility and potentially reducing congestion and vehicle trips that result in related hazards.

The portion of Segment 4 utilizing the San Diego County Water Authority easement road nearest to Sweetwater Dam contains a sharp curve; however, trail design will include widening the trail tread to 16 feet, posting cautionary signage, and/or placing convex mirrors as needed to preclude potential hazards. Maintenance and trail traffic will be physically separated to minimize potential conflicts and hazards.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The traffic control plan for the project will include provisions for the control of trail user traffic to provide adequate safety for Sweetwater staff, contractors, emergency vehicles, and trail users. At Sweetwater Gate 120, off Jamacha Boulevard across from Whitestone Road, the installation of “No Parking, Tow Away Zone” signs and additional signage indicating the staging area location on Lakeview Avenue, will minimize potential conflicts with emergency access. The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. In addition, the project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County. Impacts are considered less than significant.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: As part of the proposed project, adequate public parking will be provided at Staging Area 1 at Sweetwater Summit Regional Park in Bonita and at Staging Area 2 near the intersection of Lakeview Avenue and Quarry Road in Spring Valley. At Sweetwater Gate 120, off Jamacha Boulevard across from Whitestone Road, there is an open area that could attract unauthorized parking by trail users. Signage will be installed indicating the location of the staging area on Lakeview Avenue and “No Parking, Tow Away Zone” signs will be installed at all unauthorized parking areas to minimize unauthorized parking.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes is intended to establish and formalize a recreational opportunity around the Sweetwater Reservoir for hikers, bikers, and equestrian users. The proposed project will connect to the existing southern portion of the loop trail system so as to eventually allow for non-motorized, recreational opportunities completely around the Sweetwater Reservoir, a 14.1-mile loop trail. No feature of the proposed project would result in a conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Wastewater treatment in the surrounding area is provided by the Metropolitan Wastewater District of Southern California, which operates its facility in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The primary sources of pollutants to storm water from the proposed project are construction activities and runoff from parking lots. Due to the project's proximity to the Sweetwater Reservoir, implementation of effective BMPs is necessary to protect water quality of this adjacent water body. Required permits for the proposed project include 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The County will obtain all required permits prior to initiation of construction of the project.

As part of the proposed project, Staging Area 2 will require the installation of facilities to include bathroom and drinking water facilities. Additional facilities will also be incorporated at staging areas to provide amenities to hikers, bikers, and equestrian users. Treatment of any wastewater from these staging area amenities is anticipated to

be routine and is not expected to exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not include the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The proposed trail improvements and recreational amenities at staging areas are not expected to require the construction of new or expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project will therefore not cause significant environmental effects resulting from construction or expansion of such facilities.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: As part of the proposed project, the following new or expanded drainage facilities will be constructed and installed:

Segment 1: Drainage improvements required for Segment 1 include installation of 18" and 24" corrugated metal pipe (CMP) culverts that will convey drainage from the trail and adjacent properties into a proposed 18" reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) stormdrain. The stormdrain will replace an existing wooden "trough"

in order to properly convey stormwater during rain events and runoff from Sweetwater Road.

Segment 1a: Drainage improvements required for Segment 1a include installation of an 8" RCP culvert under the trail, associated head wall, catch basin and rip rap energy dissipater in order to convey nuisance flow from the adjacent homes to the south.

Segment 4: Near the southern portion of Segment 4, an 18" RCP drainage pipe, wing walls at the inlet and outlet, as well as a rip rap energy dissipater will be constructed to convey water in this section under the trail. The trail itself will be constructed as a raised causeway approximately 650 feet in length.

Segment 5: Drainage facilities to be constructed as part of Segment 5 include an 18" RCP culvert under the trail, associated wing walls, and a drainage ditch along the south side of the trail located approximately 300 feet east of the intersection of Segment 3 and Segment 5. The drainage ditch will convey water on the south side of the trail toward the new culvert.

Segment 6: Drainage improvements for Segment 6 will consist of installation of two crossings traversing areas of disturbed freshwater marsh. The crossings will require the installation of culverts under the trail to allow for proper stormwater conveyance.

Segment 7: Drainage improvements for Segment 7 will include installation of one crossing. The crossing will require installation of a culvert under the trail for proper water conveyance.

Segment 8: Drainage improvements for Segment 8 will consist of installation/improvement of two crossings across areas of disturbed freshwater marsh. One crossing will require installation of a culvert under the trail to allow for proper stormwater conveyance. The second crossing will be the extension of an existing culvert.

Construction of the proposed northern trail segments will require drainage crossings over several named and unnamed drainages under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The proposed project would result in direct and indirect impacts to biological resources within and adjacent to the project

area. Direct impacts would result as a result of habitat removal for widening of existing paths for the trail segments and drainage crossings. As described in Section IV, Biological Resources, design features and mitigation measures are incorporated in the proposed project and will be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to biological resources. The County will obtain all required permits to address temporary and permanent impacts to jurisdictional resources. Required permits include a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFG, a 404 Nationwide Permit from the ACOE, and a 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). In addition, the project would require approval of a General Construction Storm Water Permit from the RWQCB.

After implementation of required mitigation and approval of required permits, the project's impacts resulting from new and/or expanded storm water drainage facilities will be reduced to below a level of significance.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: As part of the proposed project, potable water will be required for drinking facilities at the proposed staging areas. Water supplies will also be required to serve other staging area amenities such as bathroom facilities. Water would be provided by the Sweetwater Authority under the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), which provides domestic water service to the area. Sufficient water supplies to serve the minimal demand of the project is expected from existing entitlements and resources.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not include the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The proposed trail improvements and recreational amenities at staging areas are not expected to require the construction of new or expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is therefore not expected to interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste from the use of amenities and recreational facilities at the proposed staging areas. All solid waste facilities, including landfills, require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Sufficient permitted solid waste capacity is expected to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Based on the environmental evaluation and discussion contained in this Environmental Initial Study, the proposed project would potentially degrade the quality of the environment and result in significant impacts to the following areas without mitigation incorporated: biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems. In addition to project specific impacts, this environmental evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to reduce impacts in these areas to below a level of significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Environmental Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Sweetwater Valley Sewer Outfall Suspension Bridge	UJ2116
Carriage Hills Tentative Map	TM 5355
SR 125 Construction Project	Unknown
Perdue water treatment plant master plan	Unknown

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this Environmental Initial Study. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to biological resources, water quality, and recreational facilities. Mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce these cumulative effects to below a level of significance. Refer to Sections IV(a-c), VIII(a), and XIV(b) for a discussion of mitigation associate with impacts to those resources. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Environmental Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in Sections I (Aesthetics), III (Air Quality), VI (Geology and Soils), VII (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), VIII (Hydrology and Water Quality) XI (Noise), XII (Population and Housing), and XV (Transportation and Traffic). As a result of this evaluation, it was determined that there are potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following: biological resources, water quality, recreation, to reduce these effects to below a level of significance. Refer to the appropriate sections of this Environmental Initial Study for a discussion of mitigation measures associate with impacts to those resources. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulations are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulations, refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulations, refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

- California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)
- California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ((www.co.san-diego.ca.us))
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).
- Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)
- Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)
- International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)
- US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)
- US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conservation, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
(www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2.
(www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

ICF Jones and Stokes. Biological Technical Report for The Northern Segment of the Sweetwater Loop Trail Project. July 2008.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

ICF Jones and Stokes. Negative Cultural Resources Report for the Sweetwater Loop Trail Project. April 2008

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16

USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

Burns & McDonnell. Water Quality Report for the Sweetwater Loop Trail Project. December 2004

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego DPW Environmental Services Unit. Technical Report for Segment 8 at the Sweetwater Reservoir. March 2008

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972,
Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-
Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United
States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220,
1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.
(www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water
Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality
Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.
(www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES
Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water
Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.
(www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and
Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land
Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San
Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines,
2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources
Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations,
Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title
14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001.
(ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51,
California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and
Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title
8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84:
Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.
(www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land
Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and
amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000.
(ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance,
compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631.
1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego
County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by
Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and
Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press
Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq.
1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS
Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS)
Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR,
Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. .
(www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of

Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.